Mr. W. Jefferys Lambert
4730 Belwood Green
Baltimore, Md. 21227

5/31/90

Dear Mr. Lambert,

In your letter of the 28th you ask for an "uninhibited critique." I hope you meant it because I think you will not like what honesty requires of me.

First of all, from your sources and from what I read you don't know enough to even think of beginning to write a serious book. Using Buchanan and Harrs as sources reflects the fact that you do not know enough about fact to make responsible judgements. Include Prof. Kurtz, too. His is a very crappy book and he flaunts his ignorance in it while puffing himself up largely by trying to put others down.

Quite aside from the absence of too many books, not all good books by any means, from your bibliography, there is a simply enormous amount of documentation now available and not a few Freedom of Information lawsuits which do have information about what you are writing about. You do not even know this material exists. So, what kind of position are you in writing without knowledge of what is available? In the Archives there is a collection that takes up more than 200 cubic feet. I don't know all that has been brought to light by FOIA litigation but I have about a third of a million pages.

I've read enough to know that I'll waste my time in reading more. I'll come to what I read. In your letter you say Groden hasn't answered you. He is a good friend of mine and he never answers my letters, either. He just doesn't.

If the right tail light was not working, I was not aware of it. I also can't see what difference that could have made. However, knowing how the car was cared for and inspected, I'd be quite surprised to learn that it wasn't working.

I don't know what you can find out about the limousine except from the disclosed records and frankly, I think your interest in it of all things indicates you are chasing wild geese. I do not know if the Commission or the Archives had a separate file on it but you can write the Archives and ask it.

Your chart on page one is incomplete and I think also inaccurate. You go to all that trouble and omit the trees? You omit part of the TSBD building? And you include as built the post office building that was under construction, leading people to think that is the Central Annex building of that time, which was in the 200 block of S. Houston, with a railroad siding that is material in the post-assassination literature and inquiries and had a special relevance that day.

You also say on this page that "The best of these studies" ~~and~~ are Thompson's and Kurtz's. This leads me to urge you to stop and not waste any more money, time and hope. What you say of Thompson's work was never true of it and even if it had been by how it is terribly, terribly dated. Kurtz's egotripping is lousy, inaccurate, ignorant and also dated. And he knows so little he actually says the limousine was higher than the TSBD steps. You can't be very perceptive not to have picked that boner up. But the judgement you reflect in this leads me to believe that no matter how bright you may be in other fields, you are not really suited to serious work in this field.

On page two you say that Thompson "places" a gunman on the roof of the Courts building and that this is supported by "evidence discovered later." Thompson did not "place" anyone there. He conjectured there was a gunman there and I am entirely unaware of any kind of <u>factual</u> support for it. You cannot support your words, that "evidence" supports this. There is no such evidence. There are, of course, countless frivolous and irresponsible theories, but they are not evidence.

Not knowing you are referring to huts, you next say that "others have concluded that the shot to the front of the President's throat was fired from" the triple underpass. You say "underpass." What is triple is the overpass. There were not tripled ~~roadways~~

roadways under the three bridges.

Later on this page you say, "My goal was to derive a logical pattern ~~from~~ in the scientific data that would pinpoint...." What scientific data are you talking about? Buchanan's? Marrs? Kurtz's? The Commissions? The HSCA's? (not in your biblio.) You've not got even the remotest notion of what scientific data there is that you can have access to or even what the areas of the testing were. You merely assume that what you know about is all there is. It isn't. You also assume that there was a definitive examination of all that needed examining and that you've seen all of it. None of this is true.

Where I stopped and was certain that going any farthur is a waste of time is page 3: "Still, the origin of the throat wound can be pinpointed by combining the timing data of the Zapruder film, logical deduction, the autopsy findings, medical observations and, finally, photogrammetry." I'm certain you mean this and are quite sincere in it but the plain and simple truth is that it is utter nonsense. I'm going into all the detail possible but suppose the President was first shot at, say, Z Frame 188, how will you be able to establish that? Or, when the car was obscured from the camera by the road sign, whether that shot was when it was first obscured or toward the end of the time it was? How in the world can you omit the position of the body, which you don't mention, and how can you know for the time the camera could not pick it up?

Being concerned, wanting to do something, are commendable things. But evolving a work of fiction, especially if you could get it published, which I do not believe you could, would only mislead those many concerned Americans who do care.

I do not intend to offend you. I'm trying to be helpful to you. This is an enormously complicated business, with an enormous amount of misinformation and disinformation to mislead and deceive you, and as you apparently do not realize, was never really investigated officially. The crime itself, I mean, was never really officially investigated. The FBI and the Commission wanted to make the preconception appear to be reasonable. Neither ever really investigated the crime itself.

In reading and correcting this I note you quote what you regard as authorities as saying that a shot came from the bridge. How can that possibly be when there were about a dozen people there plus a couple of cops? Plus God knows how many people who could have seen a shooter from where they were elsewhere.

I regret the need to discourage you but you asked me to be forthright and I am.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg